C, P, and CP asymmetry observables based on triple product asymmetries

A. J. Bevan
Queen Mary University of London, Mile End Road, E1 4NS, United Kingdom
(Dated: May 19, 2015)

Triple product asymmetries have been used to probe CP violation in K, D, and B decays. Here we review the interpretation of those asymmetries, and note that it is possible to construct twelve measurable triple product asymmetries for the decay of a particle into a four body final state. Eight of these asymmetries are introduced here and nine have never been measured before. These can be used to systematically test C, P, and CP symmetries in decays to four body final states. In particular we note that these asymmetries can be used to study symmetry invariance in Higgs, Z^0, top-quark, and hadron decay (both baryon and meson) as well as for $\tau^{\pm}$ decay. At low energy theoretical uncertainties arising from QCD effects will impede the interpretation of some of these asymmetries.

PACS numbers: 13.25.Hw, 12.15.Hh, 11.30.Er

arXiv:1408.3813v3 [hep-ph] 17 May 2015

I. INTRODUCTION

The weak interaction of quarks and leptons is known to maximally violate parity (P) [1] and charge conjugation (C)[1] symmetries. The combination CP is rarely violated in weak decay, however in certain circumstances CP violation is found to occur [2–4], and that in itself has significant ramifications for trying to understand why the universe is matter dominated [5]. While C and P violation is understood in terms of chiral nature of the weak interaction, CP violation is described by the ad-hoc 3×3 unitary Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa (CKM) quark mixing matrix [6, 7]. This matrix in turn is related to the Higgs Yukawa couplings in the standard model of particle physics (SM) and is not yet understood at a fundamental level. The use of scalar triple product asymmetries to test the weak interaction description of nature has been explored for many decades (for example see [8–13] and references therein). These asymmetries have been measured in kaon, charm, and B decays and a detailed discussion of those results is summarised in a recent review [14]. We revisit the interpretation of triple product asymmetries in the context of the decay of a particle M to a four body final state $abcd = f$. A total of twelve asymmetries are discussed in the context of testing weak interactions under C, P, and CP symmetry transformations, where three have been measured previously, eight have been introduced here, and the remaining one is mentioned in [12, 14]. This paper discusses three types of decay. The most general case (type 1) is valid for decays where $M \neq \overline{M}$ and $abcd \neq \overline{abcd}$. We consider two simplifications; type 2 where $M \neq \overline{M}$ and $abcd = \overline{abcd}$, and type 3 where $M = \overline{M}$ and $abcd = \overline{abcd}$. The twelve asymmetries are valid for cases 1 and 2, and compactify to only a single unique asymmetry in case 3, which is a test of both P and CP. Examples of each of these types of decay are $D_s^+ \to K_S^0 K^+\pi^+\pi^-$, $D^0 \to K^+K^-\pi^+\pi^-$, and $K_L^0 \to \pi^+\pi^- e^+ e^-$, respectively.

Following this we proceed to consider the use of triple product asymmetries to constrain symmetry non-invariance in the decay of top-quarks, H^0, Z^0, heavy meson systems, and for τ leptons. These symmetry invariance tests can be performed at the LHC general purpose detectors ATLAS and CMS, future Higgs and top factories, and flavour physics experiments such as *BABAR*, Belle (II), BES III, LHCb, NA62, and VEPP. They are valid in a general sense, and can be used to probe the weak interaction properties of particles in the context of the SM. They are also applicable in the study of new physics, should experiments find new particles that decay into four body final states, at some point in the future. Similarly one can indirectly probe for new physics via interference effects that could result in C, P, or CP violation in Z^0 or H^0 decay beyond the SM.

The triple product is given by $\psi = \vec{p}_c \cdot (\vec{p}_a \times \vec{p}_b)$, where the $\vec{p}_i$, $i = a, b, c$ are particle momentum vectors computed in the rest frame of M. If one considers the decay of a particle into a final state with four daughters, then one can construct a triple product that uniquely defines the kinematics of that final state in terms of any three of the four as the mass of the mother particle M can be used to constrain the kinematics. The daughter particles themselves are not required to be stable.

For the four body decay $M \to f$ shown in Fig. 1 one can define the angle between the two decay planes defined by ab and cd as ϕ (or equivalently in terms of the normals to the decay planes). Conventionally one defines the normals to these decay planes as $\widehat{n}_{ab}$ and $\widehat{n}_{cd}$, respectively. It is straightforward to show that

$$\sin\phi \;=\; (\widehat{n}_{ab} \times \widehat{n}_{cd}) \cdot \widehat{z}. \qquad (1)$$

The unit vector $\widehat{z}$ is defined as the direction $\vec{p}_a + \vec{p}_b$. Hence one can compute asymmetries based on the sign

[1] For example this is evident from meson decays to flavour specific final states.

of ψ of $\sin\phi$ or as a function of $\sin\phi$. In the case of the decay $K^0 \to \gamma\gamma$ Dreitlein and Primakoff have noted that a triple product can be constructed to measure a time-dependent linear polarisation effect [15]. Terms of $\sin 2\phi$ are interesting to study for some decay channels as noted in [9, 11, 14, 16, 17], where the focus is on the study of the linear polarisation basis of D and $B_{(s)}$ decays to two vector particle states, which subsequently decay to a four particle final state.



FIG. 1: The reference decay $M \to f$ as described in the text.

A triple product is even (odd) under C (P, T, and CP), as can be seen in the following:

$$C[\vec{p}_c \cdot (\vec{p}_a \times \vec{p}_b)] = \overline{\vec{p}_c \cdot (\vec{p}_a \times \vec{p}_b)}, \quad (2)$$

$$P[\vec{p}_c \cdot (\vec{p}_a \times \vec{p}_b)] = -\vec{p}_c \cdot (\vec{p}_a \times \vec{p}_b), \quad (3)$$

$$T[\vec{p}_c \cdot (\vec{p}_a \times \vec{p}_b)] = -\vec{p}_c \cdot (\vec{p}_a \times \vec{p}_b), \quad (4)$$

$$CP[\vec{p}_c \cdot (\vec{p}_a \times \vec{p}_b)] = -\overline{\vec{p}_c \cdot (\vec{p}_a \times \vec{p}_b)}. \quad (5)$$

It follows that one can compare event distributions for $\sin n\phi$ (or ψ) > 0, where $n = 1, 2$, against those with $\sin n\phi$ or $\psi < 0$ in order to probe the nature of the triple product under these symmetry transformations. However it is necessary to study physical observables directly. One requires the decay of some parent particle to the final state where we may subsequently construct a triple product, and also physically determine the symmetry transformed process to compare with. Hence it is not possible to test T as one can not prepare the conjugate process $abcd \to M$. However, P can be studied by comparing $M \to abcd$ events for the triple product being greater than (+) or less than (−) zero and similarly for the Charge Conjugate process $\overline{M} \to \overline{f}$. One can also test C and CP using similar asymmetries as discussed below. We denote the rates of particle (anti-particle) decay as $\Gamma_\pm$ ($\overline{\Gamma}_\pm$), where the subscript indicates the sign of the triple product. In the following we construct a number of asymmetry observables that can be computed as a function, or by integrating over positive and negative values, of the triple product.

II. ASYMMETRIES

By considering decay rates of (anti-)particles under the Parity operator it is possible to construct the following asymmetries

$$A_P = \frac{\Gamma_+ - \Gamma_-}{\Gamma_+ + \Gamma_-}, \quad \overline{A}_P = \frac{\overline{\Gamma}_+ - \overline{\Gamma}_-}{\overline{\Gamma}_+ + \overline{\Gamma}_-}. \quad (6)$$

In the absence of final state interactions (FSI) [2] that arise from long distance strong interaction effects (which therefore conserve C, P, and CP) a non-zero value of A_P or $\overline{A}_P$ signifies Parity violation. If FSI are present then one has to understand the impact of this on the triple product asymmetry in order to extract the magnitude of the underlying Parity violating effect, if that is possible. HQET and factorisation calculations are being tested for Λ_b decays with regard to the measurement of α_b as discussed below where it is now possible to compare experiment with predictions. However, in general for lower energy systems soft QCD effects are not well understood and it is not clear when or if equivalent exercises can be made. Discussion on the importance of these effects for different final states can be found in Refs [9, 20], however more work in this area might help us to interpret results that have appeared in recent years. Another issue to be mindful of is that as strong phases can vary across phase space, if one integrates over part of that phase space (e.g for $\sin\phi > 0$) to compare with another region (e.g. $\sin\phi < 0$), any strong phase difference contribution to an asymmetry may generate an artificial signal unrelated to the weak dynamics of interest. This can be important for K, D, and B meson systems where significant FSI contributions may be manifest in some decays.

By considering both C and CP operators on Eqns (6) one can construct C and CP asymmetries from the difference and sum of A_P and $\overline{A}_P$, which we denote as

$$a_C^P = \frac{1}{2}\left(A_P - \overline{A}_P\right), \quad (7)$$

$$a_{CP}^P = \frac{1}{2}\left(A_P + \overline{A}_P\right), \quad (8)$$

respectively. The literature often refers to $A_P = A_T$, $\overline{A}_P = \overline{A}_T$ and the CP asymmetry $a_C^P = \mathcal{A}_T$ in terms of the T-odd nature of the underlying triple product; we prefer to denote the symmetry under scrutiny.

Now we consider (anti-)particle decays under the operation of Charge Conjugation to construct the following two asymmetries

$$A_C = \frac{\overline{\Gamma}_- - \Gamma_-}{\overline{\Gamma}_- + \Gamma_-}, \quad \overline{A}_C = \frac{\overline{\Gamma}_+ - \Gamma_+}{\overline{\Gamma}_+ + \Gamma_+}. \quad (9)$$

Weak phases change sign under C, whereas strong phases do not, thus any strong interaction contribution should

[2] For a discussion of FSI please see, for example, Refs [18, 19].

cancel in A_C and $\overline{A}_C$. Hence non-zero values of these parameters signify violation of the Charge Conjugation symmetry. On noting that the two C asymmetries are themselves conjugated under P, one can combine these to form the Parity asymmetry

$$a_P^C = \frac{1}{2}(A_C - \overline{A}_C), \tag{10}$$

and similarly construct the equivalent CP asymmetry

$$a_{CP}^C = \frac{1}{2}(A_C + \overline{A}_C). \tag{11}$$

We note that on combining these terms into a single fraction the numerators for a_P^C and a_C^P are equal, however the denominators differ. The common condition for these symmetry violations is $\overline{\Gamma}_-\Gamma_+ - \overline{\Gamma}_+\Gamma_- \neq 0$.

Finally we can consider the decay rates under the CP transformation, yielding

$$A_{CP} = \frac{\overline{\Gamma}_+ - \Gamma_-}{\overline{\Gamma}_+ + \Gamma_-}, \quad \overline{A}_{CP} = \frac{\overline{\Gamma}_- - \Gamma_+}{\overline{\Gamma}_- + \Gamma_+}, \tag{12}$$

where the sign convention is chosen to follow that used for direct CP asymmetries and for time-dependent CP asymmetries; i.e. the difference between the normalised anti-particle and particle rates. As with the observables A_P and $\overline{A}_P$, these CP asymmetries may not be theoretically clean for some low energy measurements as different parts of phase space are sampled when constructing A_{CP} and $\overline{A}_{CP}$. It is possible to construct two additional asymmetries by considering P and C transformations on these CP asymmetries, which are given by

$$a_P^{CP} = \frac{1}{2}(A_{CP} - \overline{A}_{CP}), \tag{13}$$

$$a_C^{CP} = \frac{1}{2}(A_{CP} + \overline{A}_{CP}). \tag{14}$$

On combining these terms into a single fraction the numerators for these observables are the same as those for a_{CP}^P and a_{CP}^C, respectively, but the denominators are different. The underlying conditions for this kind of symmetry violation for a_P^{CP} and a_{CP}^P is $\overline{\Gamma}_+\Gamma_+ - \overline{\Gamma}_-\Gamma_- \neq 0$. Likewise for a_C^{CP} and a_{CP}^C the condition is $\overline{\Gamma}_-\overline{\Gamma}_+ - \Gamma_-\Gamma_+ \neq 0$.

The twelve symmetries introduced here are valid for decays of type 1 and 2. For type 3 transitions only the six asymmetries A_P, $\overline{A}_P$, A_{CP}, $\overline{A}_{CP}$, a_P^{CP}, and a_{CP}^P remain non-trivial but are all equivalent. This remaining asymmetry is a test of both P and CP in terms of the average rate $\langle\Gamma\rangle$;

$$A_{P,CP} = \frac{\langle\Gamma\rangle_+ - \langle\Gamma\rangle_-}{\langle\Gamma\rangle_+ + \langle\Gamma\rangle_-}, \tag{15}$$

or equivalently using the total rates $\Gamma_\pm$.

Thus far the focus on studies of triple product asymmetries has been in terms of searching for a violation of CP. In order to do this one needs to study rare processes with two or more interfering amplitudes. This criterion is relaxed if one cares about studying P symmetries which is maximally violated by the nature of the weak interaction. The study of copious Cabibbo favoured processes in order to understand how the weak interaction and hadronisation processes contribute to such decays is also of interest. While P should be violated for such transitions, one expects that C and CP violation would not be manifest.

From the discussion so far is not straightforward to understand how measurements of these asymmetries might provide useful information about weak interactions. A naive example to illustrate the use of these asymmetries is to assume just two interfering amplitudes divided into regions of positive and negative triple product

$$A_+ = a_1 e^{i(\phi_1+\delta_{1,+})} + a_2 e^{i(\phi_2+\delta_{2,+})}, \tag{16}$$

$$A_- = a_1 e^{i(\phi_1+\delta_{1,-})} + a_2 e^{i(\phi_2+\delta_{2,-})}, \tag{17}$$

$$\overline{A}_+ = a_1 e^{i(-\phi_1+\delta_{1,+})} + a_2 e^{i(-\phi_2+\delta_{2,+})}, \tag{18}$$

$$\overline{A}_- = a_1 e^{i(-\phi_1+\delta_{1,-})} + a_2 e^{i(-\phi_2+\delta_{2,-})}. \tag{19}$$

The amplitudes have magnitudes $a_{1,2}$ and weak and strong phases $\phi_{1,2}$ and $\delta_{1,2}$, respectively. The strong phases are sub-divided according to the sign of the triple product to highlight the fact that these are generally a function of phase space. On substituting $\Gamma = |A|^2$ into the asymmetry functions we find

$$
\begin{aligned}
A_P &\propto r\sin\Delta\phi(\sin\Delta\delta_- - \sin\Delta\delta_+) + r\cos\Delta\phi(\cos\Delta\delta_+ - \cos\Delta\delta_-) && (20)\\
\overline{A}_P &\propto r\sin\Delta\phi(\sin\Delta\delta_+ - \sin\Delta\delta_-) + r\cos\Delta\phi(\cos\Delta\delta_+ - \cos\Delta\delta_-) && (21)\\
A_C^P &\propto [(2r^2\cos\Delta\phi\sin[\Delta\delta_- - \Delta\delta_+]) + r(1+r^2)(\sin\Delta\delta_- - \sin\Delta\delta_+)]\sin\Delta\phi && (22)\\
A_{CP}^P &\propto (\cos\Delta\delta_- - \cos\Delta\delta_+)(r^2(\cos\Delta\delta_- + \cos\Delta\delta_+) + r(1+r^2)\cos\Delta\phi) && (23)\\
A_C &\propto 2r\sin[\Delta\delta_-]\sin[\Delta\phi] && (24)\\
\overline{A}_C &\propto 2r\sin[\Delta\delta_+]\sin[\Delta\phi] && (25)\\
A_P^C &\propto r\left[(1+r^2)(\sin\Delta\delta_- - \sin\Delta\delta_+) + 2r\cos\Delta\phi\sin[\Delta\delta_- - \Delta\delta_+]\right]\sin\Delta\phi && (26)\\
A_{CP}^C &\propto r\left[(1+r^2)(\sin\Delta\delta_- + \sin\Delta\delta_+) + 2r\cos\Delta\phi\sin[\Delta\delta_- + \Delta\delta_+]\right]\sin\Delta\phi && (27)\\
A_{CP} &\propto r\cos\Delta\phi(\cos\Delta\delta_+ - \cos\Delta\delta_-) + r\sin\Delta\phi(\sin\Delta\delta_+ + \sin\Delta\delta_-) && (28)\\
\overline{A}_{CP} &\propto r\cos\Delta\phi(\cos\Delta\delta_- - \cos\Delta\delta_+) + r\sin\Delta\phi(\sin\Delta\delta_+ + \sin\Delta\delta_-) && (29)\\
A_C^{CP} &\propto r\left[(1+r^2)(\sin\Delta\delta_- + \sin\Delta\delta_+) + 2r\cos\Delta\phi\sin(\Delta\delta_- + \Delta\delta_+)\right]\sin\Delta\phi && (30)\\
A_P^{CP} &\propto r(\cos\Delta\delta_+ - \cos\Delta\delta_-)[r(\cos\Delta\delta_- + \cos\Delta\delta_+) + (1+r^2)\cos\Delta\phi]. && (31)
\end{aligned}
$$

Here $\Delta\phi = \phi_1 - \phi_2$, $\Delta\delta_\pm = \delta_{1,\pm} - \delta_{2,\pm}$ and $r = a_1/a_2$. One can see from this that six asymmetries can only be non zero for $\sin\Delta\phi \neq 0$. These are A_C^P, A_C, $\overline{A}_C$, A_P^C, A_{CP}^C, and A_C^{CP}. The asymmetries A_C, $\overline{A}_C$ have the same form as time-integrated direct *CP* asymmetries studied in kaon, D and B decays. The remaining asymmetries can be non zero under more relaxed conditions that include non-zero strong phase differences even if weak phase differences are zero. The expected result that $\mathcal{A}_T = A_C^P \propto \sin\Delta\phi$ can be seen in Eq. (22).

A number of experiments have measured what we call A_P, $\overline{A}_P$, and the normalised difference of the two, a_C^P. We believe that the interpretation of these three observables as presented here is physically more intuitive than the traditional description, which typically invokes T. This interpretation naturally leads us to introduce the additional observables outlined above. Likewise the T-odd *CP* asymmetry of Eq. (15) can simply be described as a simultaneous test of P and *CP* violation; there is no need to invoke T (as the triple product is odd under both T and P) as pointed out some time ago [21].

III. POTENTIAL APPLICATIONS

We now turn to the question of what decays are interesting to study, but before talking about channels in detail, we note that non-zero *CP* asymmetries are the result of interference between two or more amplitudes. Likewise both C and P asymmetries should be manifest via the V-A structure of the weak interaction, however quark hadronisation may wash out effects of interest. Therefore one can study these observables in two different contexts: (i) to determine non-zero asymmetries where some non-trivial effect relating to the SM is expected and subsequently try to understand that measurement, and (ii) to test the prediction of a null effect, where a departure from some null asymmetry would indicate a previously unconsidered amplitude beating against the SM contribution. In the SM Lagrangian the quark fields transform under C (hence *CP*) and T such that the CKM matrix element couplings V_{ij} change to their conjugates V_{ij}^*; i.e. weak phases change sign under C, *CP*, and T, whereas strong phases do not. Hence with an appropriate model one may determine, or constrain, ratios of amplitudes and phase differences from combinations of non-zero asymmetries. The measurements made thus far in D decays have been done by integrating over phase space without considering the underlying contributions to the four body transition. In general a four body amplitude analysis would give more information about the weak interaction for these decays, however such an analysis would be challenging, and results would be model dependent. An alternative simplified, and model independent, approach is to measure these asymmetries as a function of the possible physical combinations of m_{ab} and m_{cd}. Both model dependent and model independent approaches facilitate tests of C, P, and *CP* using triple product asymmetries. In particular as the weak interaction maximally violates parity for quark interactions, whilst the strong interaction conserves this symmetry, asymmetries as a function of the mass distributions m_{ab} and m_{cd} may provide an insight into the underlying dynamics of the decay. Indeed it is quite plausible that a detailed study may lead to one finding regions of phase space that show large parity violation as well as regions that conserve parity, so that overall one finds non-maximal asymmetries when integrating over all phase space.

Having laid out the framework of asymmetries we now proceed to consider existing, and possible future, measurements of each of the three decay types in turn.

Type 1: Decays of the form $M \neq \overline{M}$ and $abcd \neq \overline{abcd}$. The FOCUS experiment has measured triple product asymmetries for the decays of D^+ and D_s^+ to $K_S^0K^+\pi^+\pi^-$ final states [22]. The results obtained for a_{CP}^P are $0.023 \pm 0.062 \pm 0.022$ and $-0.036 \pm 0.067 \pm 0.034$,

respectively. These have been referred to as tests of T violation, however we prefer to distinguish between the triple product tests discussed here and the more formally correct treatment of T violation tests. See the Particle Data Group discussion of Kabir asymmetry measurements and the following review [23] for further discussion on T violation. The corresponding results from *BABAR* for A_{CP}^P are $(-12.0 \pm 10.0 \pm 4.6) \times 10^{-3}$ and $(-13.6 \pm 7.7 \pm 3.4) \times 10^{-3}$ [24]. These experiments also measure A_P and $-\overline{A}_P$. FOCUS also measures the direct *CP* asymmetry (not discussed here) [25] however, the remaining nine asymmetries discussed here were not measured by either experiment. *BABAR* finds non-zero values of A_P and $-\overline{A}_P$ for the D_s^+ decay, which in general are either indicative of FSI, a weak phase difference, or both as can be seen from Eqns (20) and (21). In the context of the SM, where weak phase differences in charm decays are expected to be small, one would conclude that this effect is the result of FSI. However a more general interpretation beyond the SM can not rule out large weak phase differences in these decays. The asymmetries measured for D^+ decays are consistent with zero. It would be interesting to see what can be learned from the *BABAR*, Belle, BES III, and LHCb data using the full set of asymmetry measurements for $D_{(s)}^+$ decays, in particular for a_P^C which is a clean test of Parity.

The B Factories and LHCb have measured triple product asymmetries in $B \to VV$ decays, for example the channel $B \to \phi K^*$ [26, 27]. Here it is noted that the asymmetry a_{CP}^P can be constructed from the measured interference terms in the angular analysis. We note that LHCb's interpretation of their measured observables is in terms of T-violation, subsequently invoking CPT. This differs from a more natural description in terms of a *CP* symmetry test as presented here. It would be interesting to see a re-analysis of this type of decay in the more general context of the asymmetries discussed here, especially given that LHCb probably has sufficient data to extract time-dependent information and perform a non-trivial weak phase difference measurement in this mode. A discussion of the use of triple product asymmetries in $B_{(s)} \to K^*(\phi)\ell^+\ell^-$ can be found in [16, 17].

Type 2: Decays of the form $M \neq \overline{M}$ and $abcd = \overline{abcd}$. Searches for triple product asymmetries in decays of this type include $D^0 \to K^+K^-\pi^+\pi^-$. *BABAR* reports results only for the three asymmetries A_P, $-\overline{A}_P$, and a_{CP}^P, and measures $a_{CP}^P = (1.0 \pm 5.1 \pm 4.4) \times 10^{-3}$ [28]. Likewise FOCUS measures a value of a_{CP}^P consistent with zero [22]. As this paper was being finalised the LHCb collaboration released the measurement $a_{CP}^P = (1.8 \pm 2.9 \pm 0.4) \times 10^{-3}$ [29]. *BABAR* and LHCb find non-zero values of A_P and $-\overline{A}_P$ for this decay, which again is either indicative of FSI or a non trivial weak phase difference indicated by Eqns (20) and (21). The SM interpretation imposes small weak phase differences in this decay, and under this assumption the non-zero asymmetries are the result of FSI. It would be interesting to see what can be learned from the *BABAR*, Belle, BES III, and LHCb data using the full set of asymmetry measurements for D^0 decays, particularly for a_P^C. For illustrative purposes we proceed to interpret the published data from *BABAR* in terms of the asymmetries discussed here. The results of this are summarised in Table I, where the published asymmetries are taken verbatim from [28] and error propagation, under the assumption of Gaussian errors, is used to compute the statistical uncertainties on the other nine quantities. These data are compatible with P and C violation, although this is not maximal. The observed levels of P and C violation balance such that *CP* is found to be conserved. This interpretation neglects systematic uncertainties, however we don't expect a significant change to the conclusions drawn if *BABAR* re-analyse their data in this context. The LHCb data, when re-analysed in the same way, are completely consistent with this interpretation of the *BABAR* result. The LHCb experiment has also measured triple product asymmetries for $B_s \to \phi\phi$ decays, which are compatible with the hypothesis of *CP* conservation [30]. A more comprehensive study of that final state is called for.

TABLE I: Computed asymmetries for $D^0 \to K^+K^-\pi^+\pi^-$ from the *BABAR* data. Only statistical uncertainties are shown and the numbers in parentheses correspond to the estimated statistical significance of the specified asymmetry to be non-zero in terms of Gaussian standard deviations. The numbers in square brackets correspond to the significance including systematic uncertainties reported recently by *BABAR* in [32].

Asymmetry	$D^0 \to K^+K^-\pi^+\pi^-$
A_P	$-0.069 \pm 0.007\,(9.8)$ [7.5]
$\overline{A}_P$	$0.071 \pm 0.007\,(10.1)$ [8.8]
a_C^P	$0.001 \pm 0.005\,(0.2)$ [0.2]
a_{CP}^P	$-0.070 \pm 0.005\,(14.0)$ [13.5]
A_C	$0.060 \pm 0.007\,(8.6)$ [8.3]
$\overline{A}_C$	$-0.079 \pm 0.007\,(11.3)$ [10.8]
a_P^C	$0.070 \pm 0.005\,(14.0)$ [13.5]
a_{CP}^C	$-0.009 \pm 0.005\,(1.8)$ [1.8]
A_{CP}	$-0.008 \pm 0.007\,(1.1)$ [1.0]
$\overline{A}_{CP}$	$-0.010 \pm 0.008\,(1.3)$ [1.1]
a_P^{CP}	$0.001 \pm 0.005\,(0.2)$ [0.2]
a_C^{CP}	$-0.009 \pm 0.005\,(1.8)$ [1.8]

Type 3: Decays of the form $M = \overline{M}$ and $abcd = \overline{abcd}$. These include measurements of asymmetries in $K_{S,L} \to \pi^+\pi^-e^+e^-$ [33, 34]. Here we interpret the non-zero asymmetry measurements as observations of both P and *CP* violation in the corresponding decays, which is a slightly different interpretation than the usual nomenclature in the literature, where they are often referred to as being simply T-odd *CP* violating asymmetries. KTeV and NA48 report non-zero values of the P and *CP* violating triple product asymmetry of Eq. (15) for the K_L^0 mode and NA48 find no significant asymmetry for the K_S^0 mode. The decays $K_{S,L} \to 4\ell$ proceed via an inter-

mediate $\gamma^*\gamma^*$ state [14, 35–37] where one expects contributions from both *CP* conserving and *CP* violating form factors. Hence measurements of the asymmetry given by Eq. (15) for these modes are also of interest.

The same logic used here in the context of meson decay can be applied to baryon decays to four particle final states, for example see [38–40], which follows on from early studies of Parity violation in $\Lambda^0 \to p\pi^-$ [41]. BES III can explore these asymmetries in Λ_c decay. More recently the LHC has measured the corresponding parameter α_b for $\Lambda_b^0 \to J/\psi\Lambda^0$ decays [42, 43], obtaining results compatible with zero from samples with event yields of about 1400 to 7200 events. One could measure the twelve asymmetries discussed here in this decay. Using the published ATLAS data as an example, one could obtain statistical uncertainties of $\mathcal{O}(3.8)\%$ for the asymmetries outlined here. Such measurements could be used to test QCD calculations to complement existing work, and may help us approach the problem of understanding measurements made with lower energy systems. Related to this it is worth noting that Gardner and He [44] discuss the use of triple products as a tool to study radiative β decay.

When one considers applications in the high energy limit it is clear that one can test the combined P and *CP* asymmetry of Eq. (15) in the decays of Z^0 and H^0 bosons to four particle final states (e.g. $4j$, $2j2\ell$, 4ℓ). ATLAS have recently reported a measurement of the branching fractions for $Z^0 \to 4\ell$ [45] using a few hundred events, which should be sufficient to start performing the asymmetry measurements proposed here. Asymmetries for $Z \to 4j$ final states (j=jet) are expected to be zero in the SM (see [46, 47] and references therein). However, this final state is more challenging than the 4ℓ one. Similarly one expects zero asymmetries for H^0 decay in the SM and so one can use triple products to search for NP [31, 48, 49]. Table II summarises the expected precision on the asymmetry given by Eq. (15) using the LHC for Z and H decays to $\mu\mu ee$ final states. We expect that the high luminosity upgrade of the LHC (HL-LHC) could yield statistical uncertainties of 1-2% for these channels. A recent paper discusses the use of triple product asymmetries to test for non-SM physics via *CP* violation in WH decays [31]. In general the associated production of a Higgs boson via VH with the vector and Higgs decaying into two particle states falls into either a type 2 or a type 3 decay. The process $W^{\pm}H^0 \to \ell^{\pm}\nu b\bar{b}$ is of the former type, while $ZH \to (\ell^+\ell^-, \nu\overline{\nu})b\bar{b}$ decays falls into the latter category. It is expected that the ILC will be able to produce large samples of ZH decays at both 250 GeV and 500 GeV [50]. Based on these estimated yields, assuming a modest reconstruction efficiency for $Z \to \ell^+\ell^-$ and $H \to b\bar{b}$, we estimate that it will be possible to obtain precisions of 2.1 (3.7)% and 2.5 (4.7)% on the asymmetry of Eq. (15) using inclusive (exclusive) Z decays to lepton pairs at 250 and 500 GeV, respectively. The proposed Chinese Higgs Factory (CEPC) is expected to accumulate about 1 million ZH decays [51]. The proposed Future Circular Collider e^+e^- variant, the so called FCC-ee project would be able to perform these measurements as well. Samples of a million ZH decays could produce results about five times more precise than the ILC. These are interesting channels to study during run 2 and during the HL-LHC assuming that systematic effects can be controlled at the LHC. The recent results from ATLAS and CMS for this process can be found in Refs [52, 53]. The ILC can also be used to make some of these measurements, where a key difference is that the e^+e^- production mechanism at the ILC leads to a different set of systematic uncertainties that affect the measurements. Hence the two types of facility will complement each other.

TABLE II: Estimated precisions on the asymmetry of Eq. (15) for Z^0 and H decays to $\mu^+\mu^-e^+e^-$ for ATLAS and CMS at the LHC and HL-LHC. These estimates are based on the published run 1 yields, assuming that the asymmetry is zero.

Data sample	$Z^0 \to \mu^+\mu^-e^+e^-$	$H \to \mu^+\mu^-e^+e^-$
Run 1 ($\sim 25\,\text{fb}^{-1}$)	0.12	0.38
Run 2 ($\sim 125\,\text{fb}^{-1}$)	0.04	0.11
Run 3 ($\sim 300\,\text{fb}^{-1}$)	0.03	0.07
HL-LHC ($\sim 3000\,\text{fb}^{-1}$)	0.01	0.02

In the SM one expects *CP* violation in the top quark sector to be small, because the $t \to Wb$ amplitude dominates in the decay. Hence any large *CP* violation observed would be from physics beyond the SM (see for example [54]). If one considers top quark decay to Zq, γq or Wb, it is clear that four particle final states are not copious, but that one can consider possible future measurements using rare decays. These include $\ell^+\ell^-q$ final states from $(Z,\gamma)q$ loop processes, where the q hadronises and subsequently decays into a two body final state. The Wb decays typically produce 3 or 5 prong final states, hence this methodology could only be applied to the 5 prong scenario by reconstructing, for example, a secondary W boson from its decay products. The possibility of performing such measurements depends on the integrated data samples, and ability to distinguish signal from background at the LHC and future e^+e^- colliders running at or above top production threshold. A lepton collider has a distinct advantage over the LHC when studying the weak structure of top quark decays for final states including neutrinos as one has an additional experimental constraint: the centre of mass energy for the interaction is known. Top-quark decays are of type 1 or 2, hence there are twelve observables to measure in order to probe the structure of these weak decays. The down side to the observables introduced here is the familiar penalty of requiring the study of rare processes. The potential benefit of doing this with top quarks is that that the rare processes may be sensitive interferometers for new physics at higher scales. Kiers et al. have discussed the use of triple product asymmetries to search for NP in the three body

decay $t \to b\bar{b}c$ [55]. The asymmetries introduced here complement the proposal of Ref. [56] to study *CP* violation in b quark interactions from samples of top events. The main difference here is that we are not restricted to studies of how a known low energy effect manifests at a higher scale via a tree level cascade of decays from t to a final state with di-leptons. These asymmetries can also be applied to loop processes, once they become experimentally accessible. It is expected that the Jarlskog invariant does not change significantly as one runs from the b mass to the Plank scale [57], a prediction which requires precision measurements from HL-LHC and future high energy e^+e^- colliders to test. A corollary of the dominant $t \to Wb$ transition is that one could test C, P, and *CP* using top quark decay with these asymmetries as a test of the weak interaction at this energy scale.

The measurement principle outlined here requires that one can determine the centre of mass frame of the decaying particle M to avoid diluting asymmetries. In the case of τ leptons this is complicated by missing energy in the final state, however this issue can be overcome in $e^+e^- \to \tau^+\tau^-$ decays at threshold, where the collision energy is well known from the machine. Hence it is possible to study these triple product asymmetries for τ leptons decaying to four particles in the final state, and in particular probe C, P, and *CP* violation via their weak decay. One should take care with final states involving hadronic contributions in order to disentangle the weak effects of interest from any long distance hadronic contributions. As many τ decays have kaons in the final state, which themselves manifest *CP* violation, one should take care to study modes that are theoretically and experimentally well controlled from the perspective of asymmetry measurements. The twelve asymmetry observables presented here complement existing techniques that have been used by CLEO and the B Factories to search for *CP* violation in τ decay [58–61] and discussed in [62]. It may be possible to perform similar measurements above production threshold, however the efficacity of such a study would depend on the extent by which the asymmetry would be diluted.

Up until now the decay rates discussed have been in terms of time-integrated quantities. However, one can generalise the discussion to time-dependent asymmetries given a suitable model for the decay. For example if one considers B^0_d decays to final states containing two pseudoscalars or one pseudoscalar and a vector particle the time-dependence is given by

$$\Gamma_\pm \propto \eta_{CP}(1 + C_\pm \cos\Delta m\Delta t - S_\pm \sin\Delta m\Delta t), \quad (32)$$
$$\overline{\Gamma}_\pm \propto \eta_{CP}(1 - C_\pm \cos\Delta m\Delta t + S_\pm \sin\Delta m\Delta t). \quad (33)$$

Here $\eta_{CP} = \pm 1$ is the *CP* eigenvalue of the decay of interest, Δm is the neutral meson mixing frequency, Δt is the proper time measured for the decay to a *CP* eigenstate, relative to the flavour tag filter event. [3] The coefficients $S_\pm$ and $C_\pm$ are related to $\lambda = (q/p)(\overline{A}/A)$, where q and p parameterise mixing in the neutral meson system and $\overline{A}/A$ is the ratio of decay amplitudes for the anti-particle to particle decay transition. The subscript sign convention follows that of the rates used for the time-integrated quantities. If one substitutes Eqns (32) and (33) into the previously defined asymmetries then one finds that they are all non-trivial in general. Thus, in principle, one may be able to relate any non-zero asymmetries to λ and in turn probe the underlying mixing (q/p) and decay amplitude $(\overline{A}/A)$ structure. The latter being defined in terms of the CKM phase structure. It is straightforward to extended this for D and B_s mesons where the lifetime difference $\Delta\Gamma \neq 0$. The corresponding treatment for decays to final states with two vector particles is a little more complicated, but follows the same logic. As an example one can probe C and P symmetry violation through measurements of the unitarity triangle angle β using $b \to c\bar{c}s$ transitions to dis-entangle the individual contributions to the overall *CP* asymmetry observed in decays such as $B^0 \to J/\psi K^*$ decays at the B Factories and the LHC. While *CP* violation is expected to be small in $B_s \to J/\psi\phi$, and it will be some time before experiments approach the sensitivity required to observe SM levels of *CP* violation, it is possible to also explore C and P violation in these decays at the LHC. One of these new observables may permit a non-zero value of β_s to be made before the traditional *CP* measurement does, however that possibility needs to be explored in more detail. It should be noted that if one combines this approach with the methodology in [63, 64], it is possible to perform a self-consistent set of C, P, T, *CP*, and *CPT* tests at *BABAR*, Belle, and Belle II. Such measurements could be used to over-constrain the set of weak interaction symmetry violation combinations to fully elucidate the corresponding nature of neutral B decays using the entangled states produced via $\Upsilon(4S)$ decay. Likewise for charm at the $\psi(3770)$.

One can also consider the use of triple product asymmetries as a tool to study C, P, and *CP* symmetry violation in the decay of a number of possible new particle states that may be found in experiments searching for physics beyond the SM. Again the general requirement is that one has a four body decay, where one knows the mass of the decaying particle and computes three of the four final state particles in the rest frame of the decaying parent. Some examples of what one may wish to study are portal models (i.e. dark forces [65–69]), light ($< 10\,\text{GeV}$) Higgs particles or light dark matter decays [70–72], and SUSY or Exotics searches at higher energies where one may obtain a cascade of particles decaying to final states

[3] This time-dependence is for correlated production of B meson pairs at a B Factory, and the corresponding form in terms of the proper time t is used for uncorrelated production for measurements at LEP and the LHC.

with jets and/or leptons [73]. For dark sector searches the decay of a dark photon A' to a 4ℓ (ℓ = charged lepton) final state (which would be rare relative to a 2ℓ state), or the Higgsstrahlung process $h' \to 2A' \to 4\ell$ are candidates of the third class of decay. Regarding searches for physics beyond the SM being performed by the ATLAS and CMS experiments at the LHC, it is worth noting that many of these involve decays to four body final states. Another example is the use of triple product asymmetries to search for *CP* violation in $e^+e^- \to t\bar{t}H^0$, which can be large in the two Higgs double model [74].

Experiments should consider revisiting analyses of triple product asymmetries in order to systematically understand symmetry violation in weak decay in terms of the Charge Conjugation, Parity, and *CP* operators. It would be interesting to see if the use of the new observables introduced here provide additional insights on the nature of weak interactions and how to relate the behaviour observed in data from the underlying weak interaction to the fully hadronised final state.

IV. SUMMARY

In summary the physical interpretation of triple product asymmetries has been reviewed, where we note that these are restricted to tests of C, P, and CP. There are twelve asymmetries for decay types 1 and 2. Only three of these twelve asymmetries have been measured before. Six of the asymmetries can only be non zero for a non-vanishing weak phase difference between interfering amplitudes, which is five more than previously noted. Therefore it would be interesting to see what can be learned from the full set of observables in previously measured charm and B decays at the flavour experiments as well as for the other systems discussed here. Table I is the result of reanalysing the data from *BABAR* for $D^0 \to K^+K^-\pi^+\pi^-$, neglecting systematic effects. This is an illustration of the application of the full set of triple product asymmetries discussed herein, where C and P violation is manifest. For decays of type 3 these twelve asymmetries compactify into a single quantity that is a simultaneous test of both P and CP. We have discussed how these asymmetries can be studied using decays of H^0 and Z^0 bosons as well as for quark flavour transitions, either via direct decay in the case of the top quark, or via hadrons for the lighter quarks. Triple product asymmetries can be used to study C and P violation and to search for CP violation in $\tau^\pm$ decay in e^+e^- colliders with a centre of mass energy corresponding to $\tau^+\tau^-$ threshold. In the event that new particles (for example SUSY or dark-sector) were to be found, then the symmetry violation structure of the decay those states could be probed using the asymmetries discussed here.

Given that it has been 50 years since the discovery of CP violation and that we are still unable to account for the universal matter-antimatter asymmetry within the SM, it would seem prudent to perform systematic searches for other manifestations wherever possible, as well as ancillary measurements that may elucidate our understanding of the origin of this phenomenon. The triple product asymmetries discussed in this paper can be used to search for and study C, P, and CP violation in the decay of bosons, quarks, and charged leptons.

This work was supported in part by National Science Foundation Grant No. PHYS-1066293 and the hospitality of the Aspen Center for Physics. The author would also like to thank Mike Roney and Mike Sokoloff for useful discussions during the preparation of this paper.

[1] C. S. Wu, E. Ambler, R. W. Hayward, D. D. Hoppes and R. P. Hudson, Phys. Rev. **105**, 1413 (1957).
[2] J. H. Christenson, J. W. Cronin, V. L. Fitch and R. Turlay, Phys. Rev. Lett. **13**, 138 (1964).
[3] B. Aubert *et al.* [*BABAR* Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **87** (2001) 091801 [hep-ex/0107013].
[4] K. Abe *et al.* [Belle Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **87** (2001) 091802 [hep-ex/0107061].
[5] A. D. Sakharov, Pisma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **5** (1967) 32 [JETP Lett. **5** (1967) 24] [Sov. Phys. Usp. **34** (1991) 392] [Usp. Fiz. Nauk **161** (1991) 61].
[6] N. Cabibbo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **10**, 531-533 (1963).
[7] M. Kobayashi and T. Maskawa, Prog. Theor. Phys. **49**, 652-657 (1972).
[8] J. F. Donoghue, B. R. Holstein and G. Valencia, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **2** (1987) 319.
[9] G. Valencia, Phys. Rev. D **39** (1989) 3339.
[10] D. Atwood and A. Soni, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74** (1995) 220 [hep-ph/9406391].
[11] A. Datta and D. London, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **19** (2004) 2505 [hep-ph/0303159].
[12] X. W. Kang and H. B. Li, Phys. Lett. B **684** (2010) 137 [arXiv:0912.3068 [hep-ph]].
[13] D. Atwood and A. Soni, PTEP **2013** (2013) 9, 0903B05 [arXiv:1211.1026 [hep-ph]].
[14] M. Gronau and J. L. Rosner, Phys. Rev. D **84** (2011) 096013 [arXiv:1107.1232 [hep-ph]].
[15] J. Dreitlein and H. Primakoff, Phys. Rev. **124** (1961) 268.
[16] C. Bobeth, G. Hiller, G. Piranishvili, JHEP **0807** (2008) 106 [arXiv:0805.2525 [hep-ph]].
[17] A. K. Alok, A. Datta, A. Dighe, M. Duraisamy, D. Ghosh and D. London, JHEP **1111** (2011) 122 [arXiv:1103.5344 [hep-ph]].
[18] K. M. Watson, Phys. Rev. **88** (1952) 1163.
[19] R. J. Slobodrian, Rept. Prog. Phys. **34** (1971) 175.
[20] M. Bauer, B. Stech and M. Wirbel, Z. Phys. C **34** (1987) 103.
[21] J. R. Ellis and N. E. Mavromatos, Phys. Rept. **320** (1999) 341 [hep-ph/9903386].
[22] J. M. Link *et al.* [FOCUS Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **622** (2005) 229 [hep-ex/0506013].
[23] K. R. Schubert, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **81** (2015) 1

[arXiv:1409.5998 [hep-ex]].
[24] J. P. Lees *et al.* [*BABAR* Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **84** (2011) 031103 [arXiv:1105.4410 [hep-ex]].
[25] J. M. Link *et al.* [FOCUS Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **491** (2000) 232 [Erratum-ibid. B **495** (2000) 443] [hep-ex/0005037].
[26] B. Aubert *et al.* [*BABAR* Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **93** (2004) 231804 [hep-ex/0408017].
[27] R. A.Aaij *et al.* [LHCb Collaboration], arXiv:1403.2888. CERN-PH-EP-2014-038. LHCB-PAPER-2014-005.
[28] P. del Amo Sanchez *et al.* [*BABAR* Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **81** (2010) 111103 [arXiv:1003.3397 [hep-ex]].
[29] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb Collaboration], arXiv:1408.1299 [hep-ex].
[30] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **713** (2012) 369 [arXiv:1204.2813 [hep-ex]].
[31] C. Delaunay, G. Perez, H. de Sandes and W. Skiba, Phys. Rev. D **89** (2014) 035004 [arXiv:1308.4930 [hep-ph]].
[32] M. Martinelli, contribution to the 8^{th} international workshop on the CKM Unitarity Triangle, Vienna (2014).
[33] E. Abouzaid *et al.* [KTeV Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **96** (2006) 101801 [hep-ex/0508010].
[34] A. Lai *et al.* [NA48 Collaboration], Eur. Phys. J. C **30** (2003) 33.
[35] T. Miyazaki and E. Takasugi, Phys. Rev. D **8** (1973) 2051.
[36] Z. E. S. Uy, Phys. Rev. D **43** (1991) 802.
[37] Z. E. S. Uy, Phys. Rev. D **43** (1991) 1572.
[38] W. Bensalem, A. Datta and D. London, Phys. Lett. B **538** (2002) 309 [hep-ph/0205009].
[39] W. Bensalem, A. Datta and D. London, Phys. Rev. D **66** (2002) 094004 [hep-ph/0208054].
[40] X. W. Kang, H. B. Li, G. R. Lu and A. Datta, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **26** (2011) 2523 [arXiv:1003.5494 [hep-ph]].
[41] J. W. Cronin and O. E. Overseth, Phys. Rev. **129** (1963) 1795.
[42] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **724** (2013) 27 [arXiv:1302.5578 [hep-ex]].
[43] G. Aad *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **89** (2014) 092009 [arXiv:1404.1071 [hep-ex]].
[44] S. Gardner and D. He, Phys. Rev. D **87** (2013) 11, 116012 [arXiv:1302.1862 [hep-ph]].
[45] G. Aad *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], arXiv:1403.5657 [hep-ex].
[46] O. Nachtmann and C. Schwanenberger, Eur. Phys. J. C **9** (1999) 565 [hep-ph/9901343].
[47] O. Nachtmann and C. Schwanenberger, Eur. Phys. J. C **13**, 315 (2000) [hep-ph/9909527].
[48] B. Bhattacharya, A. Datta and D. London, Phys. Lett. B **736** (2014) 421 [arXiv:1407.0695 [hep-ph]].
[49] D. Curtin, R. Essig, S. Gori, P. Jaiswal, A. Katz, T. Liu, Z. Liu and D. McKeen *et al.*, arXiv:1312.4992 [hep-ph].
[50] T. Tanabe, contribution to the workshop on the Interplay between Particle and Astroparticle Physics, London (2014).
[51] M. Ahmad *et al.* [CEPC-SPPC Study Group], IHEP-CEPC-DR-2015-01
[52] S. Chatrchyan *et al.* [CMS Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **89** (2014) 1, 012003 [arXiv:1310.3687 [hep-ex]].
[53] G. Aad *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], arXiv:1409.6212 [hep-ex].
[54] D. Atwood, S. Bar-Shalom, G. Eilam and A. Soni, Phys. Rept. **347** (2001) 1 [hep-ph/0006032].
[55] K. Kiers, T. Knighton, D. London, M. Russell, A. Szynkman and K. Webster, Phys. Rev. D **84** (2011) 074018 [arXiv:1107.0754 [hep-ph]].
[56] O. Gedalia, G. Isidori, F. Maltoni, G. Perez, M. Selvaggi and Y. Soreq, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110** (2013) 23, 232002 [arXiv:1212.4611 [hep-ph]].
[57] H. Prez, P. Kielanowski, S. R. J. W. and G. Mora, Phys. Rev. D **89** (2014) 073014 [arXiv:1401.4193 [hep-ph]].
[58] G. Bonvicini *et al.* [CLEO Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **88** (2002) 111803.
[59] K. Inami *et al.* [Belle Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **551** (2003) 16 [hep-ex/0210066].
[60] M. Bischofberger *et al.* [Belle Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **107** (2011) 131801 [arXiv:1101.0349 [hep-ex]].
[61] J. P. Lees *et al.* [*BABAR* Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **85** (2012) 031102 [Erratum-ibid. D **85** (2012) 099904] [arXiv:1109.1527 [hep-ex]].
[62] K. Kiers, K. Little, A. Datta, D. London, M. Nagashima and A. Szynkman, Phys. Rev. D **78** (2008) 113008 [arXiv:0808.1707 [hep-ph]].
[63] M. C. Banuls and J. Bernabeu, Nucl. Phys. B **590**, 19 (2000) [hep-ph/0005323].
[64] A. Bevan, G. Inguglia and M. Zoccali, arXiv:1302.4191 [hep-ph].
[65] N. Arkani-Hamed, D. P. Finkbeiner, T. R. Slatyer and N. Weiner, Phys. Rev. D **79** (2009) 015014 [arXiv:0810.0713 [hep-ph]].
[66] B. Batell, M. Pospelov and A. Ritz, Phys. Rev. D **79** (2009) 115008 [arXiv:0903.0363 [hep-ph]].
[67] B. Batell, M. Pospelov and A. Ritz, Phys. Rev. D **80** (2009) 095024 [arXiv:0906.5614 [hep-ph]].
[68] J. D. Bjorken, R. Essig, P. Schuster and N. Toro, Phys. Rev. D **80** (2009) 075018 [arXiv:0906.0580 [hep-ph]].
[69] R. Essig, P. Schuster and N. Toro, Phys. Rev. D **80** (2009) 015003 [arXiv:0903.3941 [hep-ph]].
[70] B. McElrath, Phys. Rev. D **72** (2005) 103508 [hep-ph/0506151].
[71] J. F. Gunion, D. Hooper and B. McElrath, Phys. Rev. D **73** (2006) 015011 [hep-ph/0509024].
[72] R. Dermisek, J. F. Gunion and B. McElrath, Phys. Rev. D **76** (2007) 051105 [hep-ph/0612031].
[73] O. Kittel, J. Phys. Conf. Ser. **171** (2009) 012094 [arXiv:0904.3241 [hep-ph]].
[74] S. Bar-Shalom, D. Atwood, G. Eilam, R. R. Mendel and A. Soni, Phys. Rev. D **53** (1996) 1162 [hep-ph/9508314].